

Boysen-Hogrefe, Jens; Aßmann, Christian

Conference Paper

Determinants of government bond spreads in the Euro Area - in good times as in bad

Beiträge zur Jahrestagung des Vereins für Socialpolitik 2010: Ökonomie der Familie - Session: Trade, Financial Markets, and the Euro, No. E12-V2

Provided in Cooperation with:

Verein für Socialpolitik / German Economic Association

Suggested Citation: Boysen-Hogrefe, Jens; Aßmann, Christian (2010) : Determinants of government bond spreads in the Euro Area - in good times as in bad, Beiträge zur Jahrestagung des Vereins für Socialpolitik 2010: Ökonomie der Familie - Session: Trade, Financial Markets, and the Euro, No. E12-V2, Verein für Socialpolitik, Frankfurt a. M.

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/37217>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

Determinants of government bond spreads in the Euro area – in good times as in bad

Christian Aßmann

National Educational Panel Study, University of Bamberg, Germany

Jens Boysen-Hogrefe*

Kiel Institute for the World Economy, Germany

March 1, 2010

Abstract

Despite the single currency, yields on government bonds in the Euro Area deviate substantially from German bond yields. These bond spreads are usually attributed to differing default and liquidity risks. The empirical literature documents that evaluation of these risks is subject to time variation in global factors approximated by US corporate bond spreads or short term interest rates. Within this paper time variation is modeled via latent processes instead of proxy variables. The findings suggest that default risk measured via expected debt to gross national product ratio explains a major part of the differences in bond yields in the Euro area between 2003 and the unfolding of the financial crises. During the financial crises both risks gain importance in explaining bond spreads, with increased relative importance of liquidity risks compared to default risks or their market perception.

JEL classification: C32, G12, E43, E62

Keywords: Euro Area, bond spreads, time-varying coefficients, liquidity risk, default risk

*Corresponding address: Düsternbrooker Weg 120, 24105 Kiel, Tel.: +49-431-8814210. *E-mail:* jens.hogrefe@ifw.kiel.de

1 Introduction

Since the introduction of a single currency in 1999 spreads between bond yields of Germany and other members of the Euro area have decreased significantly without vanishing. During the financial turmoil beginning in autumn 2007 spreads have increased but without reaching the pre EMU levels. The importance of the introduction of the monetary union for bond markets has been stressed by Codogno et al. (2003) or Bernoth et al. (2004) among others. As risks concerning real exchange rate differences are not present within in a currency union, solely default and liquidity risks remain factors causing differences between bond yields in the Euro area. Gomez-Puig (2006) points at the importance of liquidity risks, especially in terms of market size, as an explaining variable of bond yield differences, besides some impact of default risks. Jankowitsch et al. (2006), focussing on liquidity risks, come to the similar conclusion that liquidity matters, but not alone. However, both studies cover just the early years of the EMU until 2001 and some years before the EMU came into effect .¹

Besides the impact of country specific variables capturing differing default and liquidity risks several studies stress the impact of global factors for the variation of bond spreads in the Euro area over time. Codogno et al. (2003) assign a major role to US corporate bond spreads. This variable is assumed to reflect global risks as well as the level of risk aversion; see also Favero et al. (2009) and Bernoth et al. (2004). In contrast Magnelli and Wolswijk (2009) argue that short term interest rates of the ECB are better suited to capture variations of bond spreads over time. However, the situation during the current financial crisis contradicts their findings based on data spanning until 2008 which state a positive relation between short term interest rates and spreads. In early 2009, spreads peaked at the highest levels since 2001 while interest rates were at a very low level. A recent study of Haugh et al. (2009) using quarterly data applies US corporate bond spreads for capturing aspects of global risks and thereby supports this view, although, a strict relation between the level of bond spreads in the EMU and US corporate bond spreads can be doubted, too.² The US corporate bonds peaked in December 2008 while the highest bond spread was observed in Februar 2009 for Greece. Furthermore, many studies apply US corporate bond spreads for the assessment of global risks but at least quantitatively results of theses studies vary.

This study focuses on the time-varying behavior (risk aversion, risk evaluation etc.) of market participants by applying a latent variable approach in order to disentangle the measurement of global risk and risk perception. Former studies like Codogno et al. (2003) or Bernoth et al. (2004) already incorporate time-varying aspects by considering global factors as well as cross terms based on these

¹For further studies about pre EMU data see Lemmen and Goodhart (1999) or Lonning (2000).

²Further recent studies on this issue are provided by Attinisi et al. (2009) and Barrios et al. (2009)

variables. Here, chose a more flexible approach is applied, where inference on time-varying behavior is based on the observed spreads and not on a certain set of covariates. Furthermore, we consider directly the cross-sectional character the data exhibits at any point in time. Due to the adjustment speeds typically observed on financial markets and the high financial integration of the European monetary union (compare Pagano and von Thadden, 2004) this assumption seems more accurate when compared to single equation models. With the pursuit modeling approach the assumption is adapted that market participants compare the characteristics between different bonds in a certain point in time and not between the characteristics of one bond in different points in time.

An implementation of this approach is performed via a time-varying coefficient model where coefficients are assumed to follow a random walk. To enhance the flexibility in the light of the current financial turmoil model variance are admitted to have an generalized autoregressive conditional heteroscedasticity (GARCH) structure for the errors of the model.³ The time-varying coefficient model allows to monitor the impact of default and liquidity risks via the coefficients of the corresponding proxy variables over time as well as the global risk situation via a time-varying constant.

Using weekly data, the time-varying coefficient approach can explain most part of variation within bond spreads during a considerable period and enhances explanatory power to both sources of risk in the early years of the sample 2001 and 2002. At the beginning of 2003 the explained variance measure via an approximate weekly coefficient of determination suddenly drops but recovers again. The recovery is associated with the rise of the debt to GDP ratio as the single most important explaining variable. In this period the liquidity proxy is in most periods insignificant, whereas the role of liquidity during the financial turmoil recovers. The model hence underlines the finding of Beber et al. (2009) that liquidity matters in times of stress.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides details on the empirical model. Section 3 describes the data and gives some economic intuition concerning the explaining variables considered in the analysis. In Section 4 results are presented, while Section 5 concludes.

2 Model

The model structure is designed to capture frequent decisions about the pricing of 10-year bonds in the Euro area relative to German bond yields and is therefore based on weekly periodicity of data. Considering the high level of integration of the Euro area bond market, it seems reasonable that prices reflect traders' beliefs about default and liquidity risks rather directly and immediately. Modelling along the cross-section dimension seems appropriate to capture this aspect. The model is

³Thee the model is hence a modification of the models of Harvey et al. (1992) and King et al. (1994).

hence as follows

$$y_{i,t} = \beta_t X_{i,t} + \varepsilon_{i,t}, \quad \varepsilon_{i,t} \sim N(0, \sigma_t^2), \quad (1)$$

where $y_{i,t}$ denotes the return difference between country i 's bonds and German government bonds in period t . Note that for each period t Equation (1) represents a simple linear model, where parameters can be estimated via ordinary least squares. The vector $X_{i,t}$ contains relevant variables for bond pricing of country i in period t and a constant. However, as the number of countries in this analysis is limited, the inclusion of the time dimension for the purpose of inference on the coefficients in t seems advisable. This is done by assuming that the parameters β_t follow a random walk:

$$\beta_t = \beta_{t-1} + u_t, \quad u_t \sim N(0, \Sigma_t). \quad (2)$$

Note that β_t is a vector and the coefficient for a particular variable is denoted as $\beta_{k,t}$ in the following ($k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$). $K - 1$ is the number of covariates as $\beta_{1,t}$ represents the constant. For simplicity we assume Σ_t to be diagonal. Thus, we assume a model with variance parameters only. These parameters can be estimated by regarding the considerable time dimension. Coefficients β_t reflecting the judgement of market participants are assessed via a Kalman Smoother.

By considering a time-varying constant as well as a time-varying error variance the model implicitly mimics the impact of time-varying global factors. This is important, as many studies stress the impact of global factors, like risk aversion often measured by the US corporate bond spreads, on differences in European bond yields. The methodology applied here thereby allows to differentiate between variation over time and the cross country variation. The variation over time is split into direct effects of global factors (time-varying constant) and their impact on the evaluation of different risks via the other time-varying β_t . Finally, monitoring of β_t at each point in time allows to directly assess the relative importance of different kinds of risks.

As it is one goal to follow the judgements of market participants even in rather volatile times, the model assumes time-varying variances for both the errors as well as β_t . For both, GARCH-type specifications are considered. In case of the error variances it takes the following form

$$\sigma_t^2 = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \frac{1}{I} \sum_{i=1}^I \varepsilon_{i,t-1}^2 + \alpha_2 \sigma_{t-1}^2, \quad (3)$$

while the variance of each β_k is assumed to follow its own GARCH process

$$\sigma_{k,t}^2 = \gamma_{k,0} + \gamma_{k,1} u_{k,t-1}^2 + \gamma_{k,2} \sigma_{k,t-1}^2. \quad (4)$$

The inclusion of GARCH into the state-space model implies that standard Kalman-Filter used for estimation needs modification. Harvey et al. (1992) introduced ARCH modelling within the state-space frame work. A further extension is given by King et al. (1994). In their paper, a number of

asset returns follow some unobservable dynamic factors, where the idiosyncratic errors as well as the innovations of the factors are modelled via GARCH. Thereby, they provide a modified Kalman Filter coping with GARCH type volatility. This modified Kalman Filter is adapted for the state space model used here. Details are given in the Appendix A.1.

3 Data description

The analysis is restricted to the ten biggest and oldest members of the Euro area besides Germany to guarantee a relatively homogenous panel.⁴ Particularly, new member states are not taken into account, as their entry is mostly accompanied with adjustments processes of the markets which are not captured by the model here. Thus, we regard as a dependent variable the difference of the returns of government bonds with ten years maturity between these ten countries and Germany. Data is taken from Thomsen Datastream. The study is conducted for data spanning between January 2001 and March 2009.

As explaining variables we consider budget balance relative to GDP as well as debt relative to GDP as variables reflecting the fiscal stance. Furthermore, we consider the current account balance relative to GDP. The former variable is a proxy for two aspects. In the first place, it is a measure for the competitiveness of a country and therefore for its long run capabilities to fulfil foreign demands and secondly, this variable is a proxy for domestic savings. Countries with high current account surpluses accumulate high additional savings. Both interpretations may play a role for the analysis of the long run financial conditions of a country by market participants.

As the model shall reflect the behavior of market participants and as these are assumed to be forward looking, we do not consider historic values, but forecasts of the aforementioned variables taken from the European Commission.⁵ The consideration of forecasts as explaining variables follows Heppke-Falk and Hüfner (2004). The European Commission publishes their forecasts related to annual data regularly twice a year. In recent years several interim forecasts have been published which are taken into account too. That forecasts for yearly data are monitored by market participants seems reasonable as short run variations are less important for the evaluation of the mid term fiscal stance of a government. With respect to the forecasting horizon we assume that current year figures are relevant given the spring projections, while figures for the following year are extracted from the

⁴Countries considered are Austria, Belgium, Finland, France, Greece, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Portugal, and Spain.

⁵This study does not rely on other sources for forecasts as the European Commission provides consistently data for all variables and countries.

autumn forecasts.⁶

The three variables, debt to GDP ratio, budget balance to GDP ratio and current account balance to GDP ratio, are taken into account as they are mainly assumed to drive the traders' beliefs about default risks. In addition, the outstanding amount of domestic debt securities of the public sector is considered as a proxy for market capitalization and thereby liquidity measure as proposed by Gomez-Puig (2006). Here, we do not take forecasts, but historical data of the Bank for International Settlement available via their quarterly reports.

Other variables like measures for global factors like US yield spreads or short term interest rates that have been used in previous studies, like Codogno et al. (2003) or Magnelli and Wolswijk (2009), are not considered. In contrast time-varying coefficients and variances are adapted to highlight the impact of processes that are approximated by these variables.

The dependent variable of bond spreads is measures at weekly periodicity to achieve a rather close monitoring of the behavior of the model in time. However, the explaining variables have much lower frequencies, as e.g. data from the Bank for International Settlement is on a monthly basis and forecasts of the European Commission are provided twice a year.⁷ This mismatch is dealt with interpolation of the regressors. We checked the model with linearly interpolated regressors as well as with regressors where we simply extrapolated the corresponding value until a new figure gets available. Results of both approaches show very similar results indicating that results are not sensitive against the implemented interpolation scheme.

Furthermore, the explaining variables are standardized for each week. This procedure allows a direct interpretation of the absolute level of β_t with respect to their relative importance and an absolute interpretation in terms of basis points. As the mean and variance of the explaining variables vary over time this interpretational convenience comes at some costs. The importance of the direct global factors measured via the time-varying constant cannot be distinguished from the aforementioned variation of the means and variances of the regressors. Thus, the estimation is also performed for data standardized with a general mean and variance stemming from the whole sample. The main results are not changed by the way of standardization. However, the second way makes interpretation of the time-varying constant easier.

⁶Sensitivity checks show that results are rather robust against differing possibilities of consideration of forecasted data.

⁷Also Attinasi et al. (2009) apply lower frequent macro variables for explaining bond spreads.

4 Empirical Results

The model explains the variation of the spreads considerably well as for most of the periods, the (smoothed) weekly coefficient of determination ranges between 0.6 and 0.9; see Figure (1).⁸ There is one period in time where the model fails to capture the variation within the weekly data present during several weeks during 2003. Interestingly, before this period, all four considered variables have a significant impact, whereas afterwards, only the debt to GDP ratio remains an influencing regressor; compare Figure (2).⁹ Thus, the results for the early years 2001 and 2002 are in line with the findings of studies using data from these periods, namely Gomez-Puig (2006) and Jankowitsch et al. (2006). Both studies attribute explanatory power to both sources of risk. The early variation within model coefficients and model fit may stem to some degree from the relative youth of the Euro system, which is also reflected in sudden jumps within the bond returns of some countries. This has particular impact on the temporary breakdown of the explaining power of the model. The period between 2003 and 2007 has been relatively calm. Several countries even experienced negative spreads in this period, while the debt to GDP ratio turned out to be the single most important variable capturing up to 90% of the variation. These results may elucidate that the non-bail-out clause in the Maastricht treaty was taken seriously. In contrast, liquidity seems to play a minor role in this period.

In autumn 2007, the financial crisis started off and had a climax in September 2008 with the breakdown of Lehman Brothers. Many governments reacted, especially all countries under inspection in this study, compare Attinis et al. (2009), by implementing bank rescue packages. At the end of 2008, a sudden rise in bond spreads relative to German bonds has been observed for many bonds. In October 2008, for the first time a spread was higher than 100 basis points within the whole sample. However, markets did not react promptly on the rescue plans, e.g. Belgium and the Netherlands were among the first to implement a rescue package, namely at the 26th September 2009. Instantaneously, their bond spreads relative to Germany increased, but compared to later movements only modestly and decreased one or two weeks later. Even when Ireland announced its (relative to GDP) huge rescue packages markets stayed relatively calm in this very week and the following. Larger increases in bond spreads took off in late October. In December and January they increased further rapidly when economic prospects got gloomier and rumors about a second Great Depression got louder. Thus, not the rescue packages per se seemed to move the markets but the perception of risk factors.

⁸Parameter estimates are given in Table 1.

⁹As all regressors are weekly standardized, the level of β_t can be compared with each other directly, while the comparison over time depends on the scale of the regressors. Thus, in addition approximate partial R^2 are given in Figure (3).

The turbulences on bond markets during the crisis period are reflected by the model estimates in several dimensions. The error variance is strongly increased, see Figure (5), however, the explaining power of the model stays relatively sound as the β coefficients rise in absolute terms, too, and this is true for all of them. All four variables become significant. The most pronounced change can be observed for the liquidity variable its coefficient turns significant in 2007 and rises in 2008/09 enormously. Thus, already the takeoff of the financial crisis led to an increased appreciation of liquidity. However, in 2008 its partial explaining power and thus its relative weight shrunk again but recovered in autumn 2008. At the end of the sample the absolute value of the coefficient is the highest compared to the other three and therefore is the most important determinant.

The model points at changes in absolute as well as in relative terms. Both risks, default as well as liquidity, got a higher valuation for determining the differences between bonds in the Euro area, where the liquidity risk obviously gained importance. Thus, the explaining power of the level of debts for the total variation in bond spreads shrank. Interestingly, the budget balance earned more attention. For this pattern two explanations are possible. Firstly, the default risks might be evaluated by different aspects than before and the projected budget balances are regarded as an indicator for the future fiscal stance simply due to the sheer size of the current deficit dynamics. Alternatively, the importance of the deficit forecasts have to be interpreted in relation with liquidity arguments, eventually coefficients of both variables seem to be in lock-step in 2009. According to this interpretation, the deficit forecast is a proxy for current and future supply of government bonds. If supply is enormously increased based on a rather illiquid market this might have an impact.

Figure (5) shows the mean as well as the variance of the constant over time. The constant can be interpreted as the direct impact of global factors, as global risks, or the level of aversion. Due to the standardization of the explaining variables for each single week, the time-varying mean might however also capture the variation of the means of the explanatory data. To illustrate the impact of these effects, the estimation is done again without weekly but overall standardized data. Results stay qualitatively the same, but the amplitude of the time-varying constant is lowered by roughly 25 per cent. The remaining part of β_1 is accordingly still high and represents a good stake of the variation of the data over time. Not just a higher appreciation of the default and liquidity risks is found within the data (represented by the increase of the absolute values of the other β_t coefficients) but also a substantial change in the attitude towards the relative position against Germany.

5 Conclusion

Within this paper a time-varying coefficient model is applied for assessment of the spreads of government bonds in ten countries of the Euro area in relation to German bonds. This modelling approach is flexible enough to monitor the evolvement of the relative importance of liquidity and default risks and regards the high level of financial integration within the European monetary union.

Due to the single currency, which rules out all risks concerning exchange rate movements, spreads should reflect solely default and liquidity risks. The default risk is considered by inclusion of forecasts of the debt to GDP ratio, the budget balance relative to GDP as well as the current account relative to GDP. The liquidity aspect is approximated via the outstanding amount of domestic debt securities of the public sector. The analysis considers weekly spread data spanning from January 2001 until March 2009. During most of the time the debt to GDP ratio is the single most powerful explaining variable apart from a short episode in 2003 and the last months of the sample during the financial turmoil. Over long periods, mainly between 2003 and 2007, the budget balance and the liquidity variable were insignificant. With the start of the stress at the financial market liquidity gained importance and as the highest spreads rose up to nearly 300 bp in early 2009 the liquidity proxy and the budget balance projections got jointly more explaining power than the debt to GDP ratio. However, the coefficient of this variable increased remarkably, too. Thus, the default risk got a higher appreciation during the crisis as well as the liquidity risk where the liquidity risk appreciation rose faster.

References

- [1] Attinasi, M.-G., Checherita, C., Nickel, C., 2009. What explains the Surge in Euro Area Sovereign Spreads during the Financial Crisis?, European Central Bank, Working Paper Series No. 1131.
- [2] Barrios, S., Iversen, P., Lewandowska, M., Setzer, R., 2009. Determinants of intra-euro area government bond spreads during the financial crisis. *European Economy, Economic Papers* No. 388.
- [3] Beber, A., Brandt, M-W., Kavajecz, K-A., 2009. Flight-to-Quality or Flight-to-Liquidity? Evidence from the Euro-Area Bond Market. *Review of Financial Studies*, Vol. 22, No. 3, pp. 925-957.
- [4] Bernoth, K., von Hagen, J., Schuknecht, L., 2004. Sovereign Risk Premia in the European Government Bond Market. *European Central Bank Working Paper Series* No. 369.
- [5] Codogno, L., Favero, C., Missale, A., Portes, R., Thum, M., 2003. Yield Spreads on EMU Government Bonds, *Economic Policy*. Vol. 18, No. 37, pp. 503-532.
- [6] Gómez-Puig, M., 2006. Size matters for liquidity: Evidence from EMU sovereign yield spreads, *Economic Letters*, Vol. 90, No. 2, pp. 156-162.
- [7] Favero, C., Pagano, M., von Thadden, E-L., 2008. How does liquidity affect government bond yields? *CEPR Discussion Paper*, No. 6649.
- [8] Harvey, A., Ruiz, E., Sentana, E., 1992. Unobserved component time series models with Arch disturbances. *Journal of Econometrics*, Vol. 52, pp. 129-157.
- [9] Haugh, D., Ollivaud, P., Turner, D., 2009. What drives sovereign risk premiums? An analysis of recent evidence from the euro area. *OECD Economics Department Working Papers*, No. 718.
- [10] Heppke-Falk, K., Hüfner, F., 2004. Expected budget deficits and interest rate swap spreads – Evidence for France, Germany and Italy. *Deutsche Bundesbank Discussion Paper Series 1: Studies of the Economic Research Centre*, No. 40/2004.
- [11] Jankowitsch, R., Mösenbacher, H., Pichler, S., 2006. Measuring the Liquidity Impact on EMU Government Bond Prices. *The European Journal of Finance*, Vol. 12, No. 2, pp. 153-169.
- [12] King, M., Sentana, E., Wadhvani, S., 1994. Volatility and Links between National Stock Markets. *Econometrica*, Vol. 62, No. 4, pp. 901-933.

- [13] Lemmen, J., Goodhart, C., 1999. Credit Risks and European Government Bond Markets: A Panel Data Econometric Analysis. *Eastern Economic Journal*, Vol. 25, No. 1, pp. 77-107.
- [14] Lonning, I., 2000. Default Premia on European Government Debt, *Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv*, Vol. 136, No. 2, pp. 259-283.
- [15] Manganelli, S., Wolswijk, G., 2009. What drives spreads in the euro area government bond market? *Economic Policy*, Vol. 24, No. 58, pp. 191-240.
- [16] Pagano, M., von Thadden, E-L., 2004. The European Bond Markets under EMU. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, Vol. 20, No. 4, pp. 531-554.

A Appendix

A.1 Modified Kalman Filter

The model in Equations (1) through (4) can be directly interpreted as a state space model. The modified Kalman Filter needed to calculate the likelihood as well as for estimating β_t is given as follows.

The predicted β_t equals the filtered one due to the random walk assumption:

$$\beta_{t|t-1} = \beta_{t-1|t-1}.$$

Thus the corresponding variance of the prediction is given as the filtered one plus the variance of the innovations:

$$P_{t|t-1} = P_{t-1|t-1} + \Sigma_{t|t-1}.$$

If one assumed time invariant variances, $\Sigma_{t|t-1}$ would be constant over all t . However, the GARCH process has to be taken into account. Therefore the diagonal elements of $\Sigma_{t|t-1}$ follow

$$\sigma_{k,t|t-1}^2 = \gamma_{k,0} + \gamma_{k,1}\sigma_{k,t-1|t-2}^2 + \gamma_{k,2}u_{k,t-1|t-1}^2,$$

where $u_{k,t-1|t-1}^2$ is calculated via the filtered expectation and variance as

$$u_{k,t-1|t-1}^2 = (u_{k,t-1|t-1})^2 + P_{k,t-1|t-1},$$

where filtered values are calculated as follows

$$P_{t|t} = P_{t|t-1} - P'_{t|t-1} * X'_t \left(s_{t|t-1}^2 \mathcal{I} \right)^{-1} X_t P_{t|t-1},$$

$$u_{t|t} = P'_{t|t-1} * X'_t \left(s_{t|t-1}^2 \mathcal{I} \right)^{-1} \varepsilon_{t|t-1}.$$

Note that the filtered β_t simply applies by adding the predicted $\beta_{t|t-1}$ and $u_{t|t}$. The GARCH process of the idiosyncratic errors is modelled as follows:¹⁰

$$s_{t|t-1}^2 = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 s_{t-1|t-1}^2 + \alpha_2 \frac{1}{I} \sum_{i=1}^I \varepsilon_{i,t-1|t-1}^2,$$

where

$$\varepsilon_{t-1|t-1}^2 = Q_{t-1|t-1} + (\varepsilon_{t-1|t-1})^2$$

and

$$Q_{t|t} = X_t' P_{t|t} X_t + s_{t|t-1}^2$$

denotes the filtered variance of the filtered errors and

$$\varepsilon_{t|t} = y_t - X_t \beta_{t|t}$$

represents the corresponding mean expectations.

A.2 Approximate Partial R^2

The time-varying coefficient of determination is defined as follows:

$$R_t^2 = 1 - \frac{Var(\widehat{Y}_t)}{Var(Y_t)},$$

whereby \widehat{Y}_t denotes the estimated vector of spreads based on the smoothed values of β_t , thus, $\widehat{y}_{i,t} = X_{i,t} \beta_{t|T}$.

The approximate partial R_t^2 of different variables is calculated as the squared coefficient of correlation of some auxiliary variables. In all cases the cross sectionally demeaned spreads are employed, $y_{i,t}^* = y_{i,t} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_i y_{i,t}$. Further, for each regressor variable a cross sectionally demeaned variable is constructed, too, $x_{k,i,t}^* = x_{k,i,t} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_i x_{k,i,t}$. Note that index k runs from 2 to K as $k = 1$ represents the constant in Model 1. Correspondingly, a cross sectionally demeaned variable is constructed representing the “rest” of the model: $z_{k,i,t}^* = z_{k,i,t} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_i z_{k,i,t}$, whereby $z_{k,i,t}$ is given as $X_{i,t}^k \beta_{t|T}^k$ and $X_{i,t}^k$ represents all regressors of $X_{i,t}$ without the constant and the variable k .

Afterwards, for each $k : 2 \rightarrow K$, the demeaned spreads $y_{i,t}^*$ are regressed on $z_{k,i,t}^*$, and $x_{k,i,t}^*$ are also regressed on $x_{k,i,t}^*$. The squared coefficient of correlation between the resulting residual series is used as approximate partial R^2 .


¹⁰ \mathcal{I} denotes the unity matrix.

Table 1: Estimation results

	ML-estimate	std. of estimation
α_0	6.82150	0.55036
α_1	0.14095	0.05147
$\gamma_{1,0}$	0.00910	0.00043
$\gamma_{1,1}$	0.39894	0.06670
$\gamma_{2,0}$	0.00216	0.00049
$\gamma_{2,1}$	0.10331	0.03716
$\gamma_{3,0}$	0.01821	0.00079
$\gamma_{3,1}$	0.06915	0.06554
$\gamma_{4,0}$	0.00204	0.00067
$\gamma_{4,1}$	0.11694	0.041162
$\gamma_{5,0}$	0.00028	0.04534
$\gamma_{5,1}$	0.13480	0.41927


Note: Maximum likelihood estimates gained via numerical optimization for the model with weekly standardized covariates. Only ARCH parameters play a role. Persistence parameters of all GARCH equations are estimated to zero.

Figure 1: Coefficient of Determination




Note: For details see Appendix A.2.

Figure 2: Mean of time-varying coefficients of explaining variables




Note: Smoothed β_t : straight line; dashed lines: 2σ confidence bands. Upper left panel: current account; upper right panel: deficit/GDP; lower left panel: debt/GDP; lower right panel: liquidity proxy.

Figure 3: Partial R^2




Note: Partial R^2 is calculated as described in Appendix A.2. Upper left panel: current account; upper right panel: deficit/GDP; lower left panel: debt/GDP; lower right panel: liquidity proxy.

Figure 4: Variance of time-varying coefficients of explaining variables



Note: Upper left panel: current account; upper right panel: deficit/GDP; lower left panel: debt/GDP; lower right panel: liquidity proxy.

Figure 5: Time-varying constant



Note: Upper panel: Smoothed mean (straight line) and 2σ confidence bands (dashed lines); lower panel: variance of constant. Estimates for the model with overall standardized covariates.